



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/812,660

03/29/2004

Adrian P. Stephens

P-9630-US

3424

49444 7590 08/04/2009  
PEARL COHEN ZEDEK LATZER, LLP  
1500 BROADWAY, 12TH FLOOR  
NEW YORK, NY 10036

EXAMINER

FOUD, HICHAM B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2419

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/04/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

1. The amendment filed on 04-02-2009 has been entered and considered.

Claims 1, 5-9,13-17, 21-26, 28-31 and 33-34 are pending in this application.

Claims 2-4, 10-12, 18-20, 27 and 32 have been canceled.

Claims 1,5-9,13-17,21-26,28-31 and 33-34 remain rejected as discussed below.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 5-9,13-17, 21-26, 28-31 and 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 1 recites "receiving from a client application, a request..., wherein the request includes a multicast address and a quality of service attribute". However, the specification as originally filed does not adequately describe the above feature. In [0018], it recites that the request of the application (client

Art Unit: 2419

application) includes a specific address for the source of the information and optionally certain QOS attributes. Therefore, it is clear that the request from the client application does not contain a multicast address. Moreover, in the specification [0019], it recites that the client MAC is the one who sends the request that contains the multicast address according to another embodiment. Therefore, Examiner concludes that the claimed feature indicated above is a new matter and without further teachings, one skilled in the art does not know how to make and use the claimed invention without undue experimentation.

Furthermore, claim 1 calls for "sending to the client application a response". However, the specification as originally filed does not adequately describe the above feature. Moreover, Figure 2 step 230 and 235 and the specification page 7, [0021], clearly discloses that the station MAC who receives the response and not the client application. Thus, Examiner concludes that the claimed feature indicated above is a new matter and without further teachings, one skilled in the art does not know how to make and use the claimed invention without undue experimentation. Similar issues occur in claims 9, 17, 24 and 31.

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 5-9, 13-17, 21-26, 28-31 and 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 2419

In claim 1, the recitations: "receiving from a client application, a request..., wherein the request includes a multicast address and a quality of service attribute" and "sending to the client application a response" are vague and indefinite because it is not known the metes and the bounds of the claimed invention. Similar issue occurs in claims 9, 17, 24 and 31.

Claim 17 is vague and indefinite because it is not known the difference between "an application requesting media" and "an application layer". Therefore, it is not known the metes and the bounds of the claimed invention.

Claims 5-8, 13-16, 21-23, 25-26, 28-30 and 33-34 are rejected because of their dependency on the rejected claim.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 5, 7-9, 13-15, 17, 22-26, 28-31, 33 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pecan in view of Benveniste (US 2005/0152324) and further in view of Pung et al (US 2002/0150099) hereinafter referred to as Pung.

***The claims are rejected as best understood:***

For claim 1, Pecen discloses a method for delivering information in a wireless network (see Figure 1), the method comprising: receiving from a client application, a request for delivery of the information (see Figure 2 box 204; wherein the user sends a request); checking an existence of a multicast address in a multicast schedule and updating said multicast schedule or creating a new multicast schedule based on the existence of a multicast address ((see Figure 2 box 206; wherein storing record of mobile device requesting multicast; inherently, there is no multicast schedule exists for the request) and, creating new multicast schedule (see Figure 2 box 204 and step 206; storing record of devices requesting multicast which means making a list of the devices participating in the multicast)); sending to the client application a response confirming scheduling of the request (see Figure 2 box 208 and paragraph 0024; wherein a signaling message is sent to clients to confirm the multicast which includes TMGI and/or see Figure 2 box 210 and [0025]; notify device that multicast is about to start); and sending the information to the client application according to the multicast schedule (see Figure 2 box 212 and [0026]; wherein the base station of Figure 1 element 112 sends the multicast data).

Pecen discloses all the subject matter with the exception of configuring a power saving protocol to accommodate a scheduled delivery of the information. However, Benveniste discloses a method that schedules the delivery of the packets according to a power saving protocol to accommodate a scheduled delivery of the information by the use of APSD (automatic power saving delivery) (see [0008] lines 11-14; [0032] lines 1-8; [0038] lines 1-4). Thus, it would have

Art Unit: 2419

been obvious to the one skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the method of delivering packets as taught by the invention of Benveniste into the invention of Pecen to increase battery life of the wireless devices.

Pecen in view of Benveniste discloses all the subject matter with the exception of explicitly disclosing wherein the request includes a multicast address and a quality of service (QoS) attribute. However, Pung discloses a method in communication networks wherein the request includes a multicast address and a quality of service (QoS) attribute (see the fields of the request in Figure 4A; the multicast ID (MT-ID) and the QOS). Thus, it would have been obvious to the one skill in the art at time of the invention to use the request as taught by the invention of Pung into the invention of Pecen in view of Benveniste for the purpose of identification and satisfaction of quality of service constraints.

For claim 5, Pecen discloses a method further comprising: deleting the multicast schedule after all clients associated with the multicast schedule have been sent the information (see Figure 2 box “stop” the end of the cycle; inherently, the multicast schedule was deleted after sending the multicast media).

For claims 7, 15 and 33, Benveniste discloses a method in wlan (see Figure 1 and paragraph 0028) and wherein a request comprises a transmission specification (TSPEC) request (see paragraph 0032; station submits a TSPEC request) and Pung further discloses wherein the request includes a multicast address and a quality of service (QoS) attribute (see the fields of the request in Figure 4A; the multicast ID (MT-ID) and the QOS).

For claim 8, Pecen discloses a method wherein the response comprises a TSPEC response (see Figure 2 box 10 and paragraph 0026; wherein the clients that requested the multicast configures itself to receive the multicast data in response to signaling message; inherently the signaling message comprises of traffic specification (TSPEC)).

For claims 9, 24 and 31, Pecen discloses a method of receiving information in a wireless network (see Figure 1), the method comprising: sending a request for delivery of the information (See Figure 2 box 204; request for multicast); receiving a response that confirms a scheduled delivery of the information to an application layer (see Figure 2 box 208 and paragraph 0024; wherein a signaling message is sent to clients (an application layer) to confirm the scheduling which includes TMGI and/or see Figure 2 box 210 and [0025]; notify device (an application layer) that multicast is about to start) and receiving the information according to the scheduled delivery (see Figure 2 box 212 and [0026]; wherein the base station of Figure 1 element 112 sends the multicast data).

Pecen discloses all the subject matter with the exception of configuring a power saving protocol to accommodate a scheduled delivery of the information to awake state. However, Benveniste discloses a method that schedules the delivery of the packets according to a power saving protocol to accommodate a scheduled delivery of the information by the use of APSD (automatic power saving delivery) (see [0008] lines 11-14; [0032] lines 1-8; [0038] lines 1-4). Thus, it would have been obvious to the one skill in the art at the time of the invention



Art Unit: 2419

to use the method of delivering packets as taught by the invention of Benveniste into the invention of Pecen to increase battery life of the wireless devices.

Pecen in view of Benveniste discloses all the subject matter with the exception of explicitly disclosing wherein the request includes a multicast designation address and a desired quality of service (QoS) attribute. However, Pung discloses a method in communication networks wherein the request includes a multicast designation address and a desired quality of service (QoS) attribute (see the fields of the request in Figure 4A; the multicast ID (MT-ID) and the QOS). Thus, it would have been obvious to the one skill in the art at time of the invention to use the request as taught by the invention of Pung into the invention of Pecen in view of Benveniste for the purpose of identification and satisfaction of quality of service constraints.

For claims 13, 26 and 34, Benveniste discloses a method wherein the wireless network comprises a wireless local area network (WLAN) (see Figure 1 which uses WLAN).

For claim 14, Pecen in view of Benveniste and further in view of Pung does not explicitly mention the use of OFDM. However, an official notice is taken in that OFDM can be used since OFDM is a digital multi-carrier modulation scheme. Thus, it would have been obvious to the one skill in the art at the time of the invention to use OFDM as a modulation scheme for the purpose of increasing the adaptation to severe channel conditions without complex equalization.

Art Unit: 2419

Claim 17 is rejected for same reasons as claim 9 since claim 17 is the system that performs the method of claim 9. Furthermore, Benveniste discloses an apparatus further comprising: a radio frequency (RF) interface coupled to the processing circuit (See figure 1 element 12; access point which requires the use of RF interface coupled to the processing circuit).

For claim 22, Pecen discloses an apparatus wherein the apparatus comprises a wireless user station (STA) (see Figure 1 elements 114) and a network adaptor (See Figure 2 element 210).

For claim 23, Benveniste discloses an apparatus further comprising at least two antennas coupled to the RF interface (See Figure 1 elements 12; wherein the AP communicates with stations using at least 3 antennas as shown by the figure).

For claim 25, Benveniste discloses an apparatus further comprising: a radio frequency (RF) interface coupled to the processing circuit (See figure 1 element 12; access point which requires the use of RF interface coupled to the processing circuit).

For claim 28, Pecen discloses an apparatus wherein the processing circuit is to send the schedule to one or more requesting network devices as a transmission specification (TSPEC) response (see Figure 2 box 10 and paragraph 0026; wherein the clients that requested the multicast configures itself to receive the multicast data in response to signaling message; inherently the signaling message comprises of traffic specification (TSPEC)).

For claim 29, Pecen discloses an apparatus wherein the processing circuit is configured to buffer application data packets for the wireless multicast until a time indicated on the multicast schedule (see Figure 2 Block 212; ending the multicast media and the last block “stop”; inherently, at the end of the schedule of delivering the multicast which can be based on time of the schedule).

For claim 30, Benveniste further discloses the use of a plurality of antennas coupled to an RF interface (See Figure 1 elements 12; wherein the AP communicates with stations using at least 3 antennas as shown by the figure). Pecen in view of Benveniste discloses all the subject matter with the exception of explicitly disclosing wherein at least two antennas coupled to the RF interfaces for enabling multiple input multiple output (MIMO). However, an official notice is taken in that the plurality of antennas can be used to implement MIMO transmission, since MIMO is the use of multiple antennas at both the transmitter and receiver to improve communication performance by taking advantage of higher spectral efficiency (more bits per second per hertz of bandwidth) and link reliability or diversity as opposite of SISO. Thus, it would have been obvious to the one skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the MIMO transmission as opposite of SISO for the purpose of increasing in data throughput and link range without additional bandwidth or transmit power.

5. Claims 6, 16 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pecen in view of Benveniste and further in view of Pung et al (US 2002/0150099) hereinafter referred to as Pung and further in view of Chuah et al (US 7,096,039) hereinafter referred to as Chuah.

Art Unit: 2419

For claims 6, 16 and 21, Pecen in view of Benveniste and further on view of Pung discloses all the subject matter with the exception of wherein deleting the multicast schedule comprises receiving a deletion request from each client associated with the multicast schedule to delete the multicast schedule. However, Chuah discloses a method wherein each client needs to send a deletion message or a membership addition message to update the routing table and to know how many packets to be duplicated (see column 6 lines 23-27). Thus, it would have been obvious to the one skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the method of updating the routing table by sending deletion messages as taught by the invention of Chuah into the invention of Pecen in view of Benveniste and further in view of Pung for the purpose of updating the addresses.

### **Response to Argument**

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 5-9,13-17, 21-26, 28-31 and 33-34 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

7. Examiner notes that the Remarks (pages 9-12) lack arguments in regard of the argued limitations since the Applicant did not discuss the references applied against the claims, explaining how the claims avoid the references or distinguish from them.

Moreover, in response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See

Art Unit: 2419

*In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Furthermore, in response to applicant's argument that Pung is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Pung teaches multicast routing satisfying QOS constraints (see at least the title). Also, all the references are classified in the multiplexing art, exactly in the multicast area same as the claimed invention.

Also, in response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

Finally, In page 12 of the Remarks, the applicant argues that the claimed QOS is different than the one used in the rejection by the examiner. However, the examiner disagrees because the term "QOS" is very broad and if a claim is subject to more than one interpretation, at least one of which would render the

Art Unit: 2419

claim unpatentable over the prior art, the examiner should reject the claim over the prior art based on the interpretation of the claim that renders the prior art applicable. *Ex parte Ionescu*, 222 USPQ 537 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1984). In *re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 165 USPQ 494 (CCPA 1970). Therefore, claims are given their broadest reasonable interpretation The Federal Circuit's *en banc* decision in *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303, 75 USPQ2d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2005) because although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). And, in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., paragraphs [0014] and [0015] (see the Remarks page 12)) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

### **Conclusion**

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

**10. Examiner's Note:** Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner. In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

When responding to this office action, applicants are advised to clearly point out the patentable novelty which they think the claims present in view of the

Art Unit: 2419

state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made.

Applicants must also show how the amendments avoid such references or objections. See 37C.F.R 1.111(c). In addition, applicants are advised to provide the examiner with the line numbers and pages numbers in the application and/or references cited to assist examiner in locating the appropriate paragraphs.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HICHAM B. FOU D whose telephone number is (571)270-1463. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 10-6 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Pankaj, Kumar can be reached on 571-272-3011. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Hicham B Foud/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2419  
07/23/2009

/Pankaj Kumar/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2419